DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

Interim Final 2/5/99

RCRA Corrective Action

Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750) **Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control**

•	Address:	Airco Welding, Inc. C/o Airco Gases, Inc. Rte 2, Chester, West Virginia 26034	
Facility	EPA ID #:	WVD 98 055 4760	
1.	Has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to the groundwater media, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste Management Units (SWMU), Regulated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been considered in this EI determination?		
	<u>X</u>	If yes - check here and continue with #2 below.	
		If no - re-evaluate existing data, or	
		if data are not available, skip to #8 and enter"IN" (more information needed) status code.	
BACKG	ROUND		

<u>Definition of Environmental Indicators (for the RCRA Corrective Action)</u>

Environmental Indicators (EI) are measures being used by the RCRA Corrective Action program to go beyond programmatic activity measures (e.g., reports received and approved, etc.) to track changes in the quality of the environment. The two EI developed to-date indicate the quality of the environment in relation to current human exposures to contamination and the migration of contaminated groundwater. An EI for non-human (ecological) receptors is intended to be developed in the future.

Definition of "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI

A positive "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI determination ("YE" status code) indicates that the migration of "contaminated" groundwater has stabilized, and that monitoring will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater remains within the original "area of contaminated groundwater" (for all groundwater "contamination" subject to RCRA corrective action at or from the identified facility (i.e., site-wide)).

Relationship of EI to Final Remedies

While Final remedies remain the long-term objective of the RCRA Corrective Action program the EI are near-term objectives which are currently being used as Program measures for the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, GPRA). The "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI pertains ONLY to the physical migration (i.e., further spread) of contaminated ground water and contaminants within groundwater (e.g., nonaqueous phase liquids or NAPLs). Achieving this EI does not substitute for achieving other stabilization or final remedy requirements and expectations associated with sources of contamination and the need to restore, wherever practicable, contaminated groundwater to be suitable for its designated current and future uses.

Duration / Applicability of EI Determinations

EI Determinations status codes should remain in RCRIS national database ONLY as long as they remain true (i.e., RCRIS status codes must be changed when the regulatory authorities become aware of contrary information).

Page 2

2.	Is groundwater known or reasonably suspected to be " contaminated " above appropriately protective "levels" (i.e., applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, guidance, or criteria) from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action, anywhere at, or from, the facility?		
		If yes - continue after identifying key contaminants, citing appropriate "levels," and referencing supporting documentation.	
	<u>X</u>	If no - skip to #8 and enter "YE" status code, after citing appropriate "levels," and referencing supporting documentation to demonstrate that groundwater is not "contaminated."	
		If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.	

Rationale and Reference(s): There are no longer any Solid Waste Management Units associated with the former Airco Welding site. Previously, Airco used two unlined lagoons to dispose of wastewater designated as K062 (spent pickle liquor) and D002 (waste exhibiting the characteristic of corrosivity). The operation of these lagoons impacted groundwater at the Airco site and the adjoining Mountaineer Park facility. Airco submitted a statistical analysis of 1991,1992, and 1993 quarterly groundwater data. This analysis indicated a significant decrease in concentrations. Noticeable increases include concentrations of PCE in well B-6-111, which went from 1.8 ug/l in February of 1991 to 25 ug/l in January of 1993.

The most recent round of groundwater monitoring occurred on February 26, 1997 when Airco and WV DEP split samples. Airco's results were non detect for all parameters except 1,1,1-TCA at 5 ug/l (MCL 200 ug/l) and PCE at 6 ug/l (MCL 5 ug/l). While Airco detected PCE at 1 ug above the Federal Drinking Water Standards, WV DEP's results were non detect for all parameters.

The geology at the site is conducive to rapid transportation and dilution (not laminar flow). This part of the flood plain is comprised of loose granular rocks ranging mostly from gravel to cobble sized. Walking this site one can feel the ground give way underfoot. A gravel operation exists due south of the Airco site.

Groundwater concentrations are below regulatory levels. The former lagoons have been excavated, filled, capped, and are behind a fence. There are no down gradient receptors for groundwater. Presently, the deciding factor in this determination is the Institutional control in effect. Should this property be sold for development in which groundwater would be consumed, more groundwater analyses would be warranted.

Footnotes:

¹"Contamination" and "contaminated" describes media containing contaminants (in any form, NAPL and/or dissolved, vapors, or solids, that are subject to RCRA) in concentrations in excess of appropriate "levels" (appropriate for the protection of the groundwater resource and its beneficial uses).

Page 3

3.	Has the migration of contaminated groundwater stabilized (such that contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated groundwater" as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination)?		
		If yes - continue, after presenting or referencing the physical evidence (e.g., groundwater sampling/measurement/migration barrier data) and rationale why contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within the (horizontal or vertical) dimensions of the "existing area of groundwater contamination" ²).	
		If no (contaminated groundwater is observed or expected to migrate beyond the designated locations defining the "existing area of groundwater contamination" ²) - skip to #8 and enter "NO" status code, after providing an explanation.	
		If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.	
	Rationale and Reference(s):		

² "existing area of contaminated groundwater" is an area (with horizontal and vertical dimensions) that has been verifiably demonstrated to contain all relevant groundwater contamination for this determination, and is defined by designated (monitoring) locations proximate to the outer perimeter of "contamination" that can and will be sampled/tested in the future to physically verify that all "contaminated" groundwater remains within this area, and that the further migration of "contaminated" groundwater is not occurring. Reasonable allowances in the proximity of the monitoring locations are permissible to incorporate formal remedy decisions (i.e., including public participation) allowing a limited area for natural attenuation.

4.	Does "contaminated" groundwater discharge into surface water bodies?		
		If yes - continue after identifying potentially affected surface water bodies.	
		If no - skip to #7 (and enter a "YE" status code in #8, if #7 = yes) after providing an explanation and/or referencing documentation supporting that groundwater "contamination" does not enter surface water bodies.	
		If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.	
	Rationale and		

5.	Is the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water likely to be " insignificant " (i.e., the maximum concentration ³ of each contaminant discharging into surface water is less than 10 times their appropriate groundwater "level," and there are no other conditions (e.g., the nature, and number, of discharging contaminants, or environmental setting), which significantly increase the potential for unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or eco-systems at these concentrations)?		
		If yes - skip to #7 (and enter "YE" status code in #8 if #7 = yes), after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration ³ of key contaminants discharged above their groundwater "level," the value of the appropriate "level(s)," and if there is evidence that the concentrations are increasing; and 2) provide a statement of professional judgement/explanation (or reference documentation) supporting that the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water is not anticipated to have unacceptable impacts to the receiving surface water, sediments, or eco-system.	
		If no - (the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water is potentially significant) - continue after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration ³ of <u>each</u> contaminant discharged above its groundwater "level," the value of the appropriate "level(s)," and if there is evidence that the concentrations are increasing; and 2) for any contaminants discharging into surface water in concentrations ³ greater than 100 times their appropriate groundwater "levels," the estimated total amount (mass in kg/yr) of each of these contaminants that are being discharged (loaded) into the surface water body (at the time of the determination), and identify if there is evidence that the amount of discharging contaminants is increasing.	
		If unknown - enter "IN" status code in #8.	
	Rationale and Reference(s):		
	2		

³ As measured in groundwater prior to entry to the groundwater-surface water/sediment interaction (e.g., hyporheic) zone.

6.	Can the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water be shown to be " currently acceptable ' (i.e., not cause impacts to surface water, sediments or eco-systems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented ⁴)?		
	If yes - continue after either: 1) identifying the Final Remedy decision incorp conditions, or other site-specific criteria (developed for the protection of the water, sediments, and eco-systems), and referencing supporting documental demonstrating that these criteria are not exceeded by the discharging ground 2) providing or referencing an interim-assessment, ⁵ appropriate to the potenthat shows the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water opinion of a trained specialists, including ecologist) adequately protective of surface water, sediments, and eco-systems, until such time when a full assess final remedy decision can be made. Factors which should be considered in the assessment (where appropriate to help identify the impact associated with disproundwater) include: surface water body size, flow, use/classification/habit contaminant loading limits, other sources of surface water/sediment contaminate water and sediment sample results and comparisons to available and approper water and sediment "levels," as well as any other factors, such as effects on receptors (e.g., via bio-assays/benthic surveys or site-specific ecological Ri Assessments), that the overseeing regulatory agency would deem appropriate the EI determination.	site's surface tion dwater; OR tial for impact, or is (in the f receiving desement and the interim- discharging tats and that in surface riate surface ecological sk	
	If no - (the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater can not be shown to be acceptable") - skip to #8 and enter "NO" status code, after documenting the unacceptable impacts to the surface water body, sediments, and/or eco-syst	currently	
	If unknown - skip to 8 and enter "IN" status code.		
	Rationale and Reference(s):		

⁴ Note, because areas of inflowing groundwater can be critical habitats (e.g., nurseries or thermal refugia) for many species, appropriate specialist (e.g., ecologist) should be included in management decisions that could eliminate these areas by significantly altering or reversing groundwater flow pathways near surface water bodies.

⁵ The understanding of the impacts of contaminated groundwater discharges into surface water bodies is a rapidly developing field and reviewers are encouraged to look to the latest guidance for the appropriate methods and scale of demonstration to be reasonably certain that discharges are not causing currently unacceptable impacts to the surface waters, sediments or eco-systems.

Page 7

7.	Will groundwater monitoring / measurement data (and surface water/sediment/ecological data, as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated groundwater has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area of contaminated groundwater?"		
		If yes - continue after providing or citing documentation for planned activities or future sampling/measurement events. Specifically identify the well/measurement locations which will be tested in the future to verify the expectation (identified in #3) that groundwater contamination will not be migrating horizontally (or vertically, as necessary) beyond the "existing area of groundwater contamination."	
		If no - enter "NO" status code in #8.	
		If unknown - enter "IN" status code in #8.	
	Rationale and Reference(s):		

Page 8

EI

8.	Check the appropriate RCRIS status codes for the Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Contro (event code CA750), and obtain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) signature and date on the EI determination below (attach appropriate supporting documentation as well as a map of the facility).			
	<u>X</u>	YE - Yes, "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" has been verified. Based on a review of the information contained in this EI determination, it has been determined that the "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater" is "Under Control" at the Airco Welding, Inc. facility, EPA ID # WVD 98 055 4760, located at Rt. 2, 2 miles south of Chester, WV. Specifically, this determination indicates that the migration of "contaminated" groundwater is under control, and that monitoring will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater remains within the "existing area of contaminated groundwater" This determination will be re-evaluated when the Agency becomes aware of significant changes at the facility.		
		NO - Unacceptable migration of contaminated groundwater is observed or expected.		
		IN - More information is needed to make a determination.		
	Completed by	(signature) (print) Martin T. Kotsch (title) Remedial Project Manager	Date <u>06-19-00</u>	
	Supervisor	(signature) (print) Robert E. Greaves (title) Chief, General Operations Branch (EPA Region or State) EPA, Region 3	Date <u>07-17-00</u>	
	Locations where	References may be found:		
	Contact telephor	ne and e-mail numbers:		
	(name) (phone (e-mail)	William Wentworth #) 215-814-3184 wentworth.william@epa.gov		